

## **Summary:**

# **Biomass Research & Development Technical Advisory Committee Meeting July 19, 2005**

**October 13, 2005**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	Purpose -----	1
B.	Welcome and Overview of the Agenda-----	1
C.	A Status Report on the Preferred Procurement Program for Biobased Products-----	1
D.	Presentation on the USDA Biobased Procurement Rules-----	5
E.	Introduction, Update on Action Items from Last Meeting, and Other Committee Business-----	6
F.	FY 2005 Biomass R&D Solicitation-----	7
G.	Review of <i>Vision</i> goal tracking document-----	9
H.	Selection and Input for a Sub-Committee to update the <i>Vision</i> -----	11
I.	Review of Committee Accomplishments and Self-Evaluation-----	14
J.	Development of Committee Recommendations to Incoming Members-----	15
K.	Public Comment-----	19
L.	Adjournment-----	19
ADDENDUM A: ATTENDEES-----		20
ADDENDUM B: AGENDA-----		21
Attachment A:	Presentation - Status Report on the Preferred Procurement Program for Biobased Products	
Attachment B:	Handout - USDA Biobased Product Procurement Preference Memorandum	
Attachment C:	Presentation - USDA Biobased Procurement Preference Primer	
Attachment D:	Presentation - Neil Rossmeissl, Designated Federal Officer	
Attachment E:	Presentation - FY 2005 Biomass R&D Solicitation	

- Attachment F: Handout - Status of Vision Goals: Biomass R&D Technical Advisory Committee
- Attachment G: Handout - Biomass R&D Committee Accomplishments
- Attachment H: Worksheet - Biomass R&D Committee Evaluation Sheet

## **Meeting Summary**

### **A. Purpose**

On July 19, 2005, a Biomass Research and Development Technical Advisory Committee (Committee) meeting was held at the Washington Marriott in Washington, DC. The Committee was established by the Biomass R&D Act of 2000 (Biomass Act). The Committee's mandates under the Biomass Act include advising the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Agriculture, facilitating consultations and partnerships, and evaluating and performing strategic planning. This meeting was the second Committee meeting held during the 2005 calendar year. The Committee members came to the meeting to hear presentations on the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)'s Federal Procurement of Biobased Products Rule, the status of the FY 2005 joint solicitation, and to review both the *Vision* goal tracking document and the Committee's own accomplishments since 2001. The Committee was also introduced to its new Designated Federal Officer, Neil Rossmeissl of the Department of Energy (DOE) Office of the Biomass Program, appointed in May 2005. Finally, the Committee developed action items based upon discussions and document reviews. A List of attendees is provided in Addendum A.

### **B. Welcome and Overview of the Agenda**

The meeting was chaired by Terry Jaffoni. Chairman Thomas Ewing's Committee membership is temporarily in advisory status only, pending correct renewal of current members. Chairwoman Jaffoni called the meeting to order, and gave an overview of the agenda (Addendum B).

Chairwoman Jaffoni asked for comments on the agenda. There were none.

### **C. A Status Report on the Preferred Procurement Program**

Roger Conway of the USDA Office of Energy Policy and New Users gave a presentation (Attachment A) titled *A Status Report on the Preferred Procurement Program*. The Biobased Product Procurement Preference Plan now in place requires Federal agencies to preferentially purchase products designated as biobased through the program, as outlined and defined in the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002. The Congressionally-created initiative increases demand for products with environmental, security, and economic benefits, while still acknowledging difficulties in obtaining or using them. Exclusions from the program include food and feed, motor vehicle fuels, and electricity. The final rule establishing the program was issued January 11, 2005, with a proposed rule designating the first group of products following on July 5, 2005. Federal agency compliance with the program is necessary after one year for products purchased at agency level for a value of \$10,000 or more.

Further regulation is applied at the manufacturing level, where products must meet statutory or American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) standard definitions for

biobased production. The program defines products for procurement within as many as 36 groupings, with plans for voluntary labeling. Each product is considered in a USDA process allowing for availability and feasibility of use, and involving public comment. Information regarding biobased products must then be made available to all Federal agencies, as the program is intended to be a model for government-wide procurement. Contacts for further information are also included in Attachment B.

William Horan asked whether the products involved will feature labeling in the form of a “bib” (biobased) logo, or some other form of identification. Roger Conway replied in the affirmative. Mr. Horan asked if Federal vehicles were to require biobased labeling on bumper stickers for using biodiesel, would the program then extend to the Presidential fleet? Mr. Conway said that the USDA program does not include oversight of Presidential procurement.

William Nicholson asked whether progress made with this program will be well publicized, in order to pressure the agencies involved to perform well. He continued by asking how the program is to be exported to state agencies or other outside entities. Roger Conway replied that the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the White House Office of the Federal Environmental Executive (OEE) officials have been very supportive of the program. In addition, agencies will be responsible for developing their own procurement plans, and are required to supply reports to Congress. Progress and performance according to program rules can be easily compared within USDA itself and across agencies. Currently, while the program is limited to federal deployment, at recent conferences, states and organizations, such as the National Association of the State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA), have expressed interest. An ongoing support effort is necessary to make sure vendors have a parallel effort that is in compliance with all regulations.

David Morris asked how the preference program interacts with current EPA Environmental Procurement Preference Plans, and which preference gets priority. In terms of Building for Environmental and Economic Sustainability (BEES) analysis and modeling requirements, he presumed all biobased products involved will have to be modeled against the current products being replaced. In BEES, the environmental performance of items is examined in tandem with its life-cycle as designated in International Standards Organization (ISO) 14000 standards, incorporating ASTM life-cycle cost methods. Roger Conway replied that recycled trumps biobased. BEES works to designate items, including the entire required life-cycle analysis and environmental effects research of products concerned. The program does not require individual products or manufacturers to spend money to analyze themselves. If a Federal agency is interested in a product, it needs to have BEES or ASTM analysis. Mr. Morris then asked whether a product could fail BEES and still be considered, with the BEES analysis simply required for comparison and measuring purposes. Mr. Conway responded that the procurement office can require life-cycle analysis, BEES, or ASTM analysis for a product. If a general evaluation is sought, ASTM analysis would be best.

Kim Kristoff asked why similar products were put into such specific smaller groups by the procurement program. For example, hydraulic oils were separated into multiple groups. Marv Duncan of the USDA responded that products in the marketplace contain significantly different levels of biobased content, and vary by how the product is being used. The goal was to designate as many products as possible this year. As for bed linens and towels, currently purchased by the military and the Veterans' Administration, with biobased production by Sorona® and Natureworks™ PLA, it is appropriate to designate them both as biobased products, even though they are labeled as separate items. The agency is dependent on the manufacturer for information about biobased content, life cycle-testing, environmental costs, and testing materials on certain products. With guidelines in the rule being finalized, cooperative interest from manufacturers is increased, which is a vital consideration.

William Horan asked whether there would be limits on the use of biobased lubricants in terms of oil spills or marine use. Marv Duncan answered that there are difficulties in this area, but that if biobased lubricants have significantly different qualities from those currently being used, then marine lubricants will be designated separately. The program is listening to manufacturers. Mr. Horan responded that ferry companies would be among the forward points of interest, paying a premium on green fuels. Mr. Duncan agreed that this is an interesting market.

David Morris asked whether there had been a push from cotton and wool industries, regarding possible substitutions. If there had been a reaction, what was it? Marv Duncan answered that Sorona® and Natureworks™ PLA are produced from wheat fibers, and, therefore, a pushback from wool, linen, and cotton industries is anticipated, though one has not yet occurred. Roger Conway added that the American Plastics Association expressed dislike of the guidelines and statute, which is considered the only pushback thus far. Mr. Morris asked if natural fibers are considered biobased. Mr. Duncan said that the statute specifies for new and emerging markets, preferring new materials, such as canaffe, over plain paper.

Thomas Binder asked whether or not cotton would be considered biobased. Marv Duncan said it was, but that it does not fit the new and emerging requirement of this particular statute.

Ralph Cavalieri asked whether or not land grant universities could receive funding from USDA to designate items. Roger Conway responded that the current guidance has no function to give extra grants for product designation. There is greater opportunity to share costs with industry and individual interests. USDA is considering a cost share program in the future.

William Nicholson questioned the 1972 rule, asking about the regulation of new and different materials made from existing natural products (specifically hybrid poplars). Marv Duncan replied that managed woodlots do not qualify. Mr. Nicholson said that corn and wheat are no longer the same essential plants as they were in 1972, and that he foresaw legal difficulties stemming from the final rule. Mr. Duncan said that in defining

new and emerging markets as those emerging after 1972, the final rule reflected comments to this effect in the conference report.

William Horan stated that cotton, when used in a blend with both Sorona® and Natureworks™ PLA, would allow the growth of the biobased market, and lessen petrochemical reliance. Marv Duncan agreed.

Delmar Raymond asked if the designation of biobased products under this rule applied to feedstocks or finished products. Marv Duncan said the designation was only for finished products.

Merlin Bartz asked about the USDA role in providing information about its Biobased Products Procurement Preference Program to other agencies. He asked how they recommend a program be implemented. Marv Duncan answered that BEES analysis, performance information from manufacturers, the Concurrent Technologies Corporation (CTC) analytical study results, information on pricing and availability, and help with direct information exchange would all help. Mr. Bartz asked if a public relations campaign could be pursued, perhaps on a website. Mr. Duncan said that the Federal Biobased Products Preferred Procurement Program website at [www.biobased.oce.usda.gov](http://www.biobased.oce.usda.gov) contained all information about biobased products in their program, the final guideline rule, proposed rules, and a place to make public review possible. In the future, manufacturer access and posting could be made possible with passwords, which may be expanded to the general public as well. The labeling program would benefit from a password-protected site to allow manufacturers to post products. Roger Conway said that David Shea of the USDA Office of Procurement and Property Management (OPPM) has been working with the Friends of Agricultural Research (FAR) on this program. Mr. Bartz said that the public relations perspective is very important, and he had seen the department release regarding Assistant Secretary Harrison's July 5<sup>th</sup> visit to speak to manufacturers' associations. USDA Chief Economist Keith Collins also travels and can do similar public relations. Mr. Duncan said there is no broad-based publicity in this area, due to lack of funding. He would like to see outreach to trade associations, and manufacturers on a number of programs.

William Nicholson asked if in the logo process, manufacturers will label only those products going to Federal agencies, or if all products will be labeled. Marv Duncan said that the labeling of all biobased products would create advertising opportunities for manufacturers and an opportunity for public relations efforts. This has not been fully conceptualized.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni appreciated Merlin Bartz's questions. She said that the program is six months from launch, and suspected that awareness was still small for these products. She asked what is being done at the agency level, aside from at USDA and DOE. She questioned whether or not manufacturers and agencies need to take further initiative in this area, and what facilitation could be done on either side. Roger Conway replied that this would be well-answered as part of David Shea's presentation later in the meeting (Section D, Attachment C).

David Morris asked whether there existed a Capitol Complex provision, requiring Congressional biobased preference in procurement, in the Energy Bill. Thomas Ewing said it seemed the Committee was seeking more information on biobased products, and reports on legislation. The Farm Bill applied only to new products, while Mr. Ewing thought all biobased products were involved. William Horan replied in the negative. He said that in civilian use, biobased products are used, and possibly rejected as faulty when needed. The government's process of testing products, then using only those that test well, is more time consuming and backwards. Mr. Morris said that there is currently no requirement for biobased procurement at the DOE, and the Committee therefore wanted to know what the USDA was doing. Mr. Horan said that in the past, it has been explained which products have to meet certain non-arbitrary requirements. David Shea responded that tracking does not exist, and that requirements are a problem. In cases such as contractor use of biobased products, the level of reporting is lacking, or the same as at agency level. Mr. Morris asked whether they knew if the Secretary's office was cleaned with biobased products. Mr. Shea said most contractors use biobased products. Exact data is not available. The USDA does not use products if they do not meet requirements, and therefore is attempting to classify all products in order to biobased content information when procuring.

David Shea continued by saying that USDA procurement contracts total \$4 billion, of which 60 percent is food. The remaining \$2 billion is not all compatible with biobased procurement. A goal of \$300 million for biobased procurement would mean that the Department of Defense (DOD), the General Services Administration (GSA), and the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) would need to participate. Military specifications and Federal specifications need to change over to biobased procurement, but this will only take place gradually. The GSA currently has an electronic shopping service called GSA Advantage, which would aid the process. Some biobased products have been designated there, but Mr. Shea has not fully reviewed the site. Some designated products are incorrectly labeled as biobased, which denotes a misunderstanding in the industry. With correct classification of products, this program would be more effective.

#### **D. Presentation on USDA Biobased Procurement Rules**

Roger Conway introduced David Shea, of the USDA's Office of Procurement and Property Management (OPPM), who works with the Assistant Secretary for Administration Michael Harrison. Mr. Shea discussed a memorandum (Attachment B) regarding the Biobased Product Procurement Preference Program. A follow-up memo requesting communication and interaction with Congress, or other conferences, has been suggested. A training module is planned for the program.

David Shea gave a presentation (Attachment C) titled *USDA Biobased Procurement Preference Primer*. The content gave more specifics of USDA procurement practices, including the designation of 83 biobased item groupings for labeling by the Office of the Chief Economist (OCE). The OPPM hopes its program has a suitable model for other offices, including several avenues to increase public awareness. The OPPM's model has



plans to report out to Congress, as well as deal with the challenge of tracking purchases, and coordinate with other offices.

William Horan asked about a possible life-cycle cost issue. Where would the waste go? David Shea responded that waste can be used on farms for composting, depending on economies of scale. They are working on a communications strategy, and on involving transaction-based systems, instead of forms, in the procurement process. In 2007 the USDA will be losing a significant part of its acquisition workforce, and will need streamlined processes to support this program.

#### **E. Introduction, Update on Action Items from Last Meeting, and Other Committee Business**

Neil Rossmeissl, Designated Federal Officer, DOE, thanked the Committee for coming, and hoped for more turn-out in the future. He asked the Committee to consider future action based on information from the last presentation, and reminded them that they are required to make recommendations to the Secretaries. Without that process, the presentations would remain simply information.

Neil Rossmeissl gave a presentation (Attachment D) regarding his background, his plans for the Committee, and suggestions for achievement of action items, including the creation of permanent sub-committees for collaboration in the areas of Policy, Intergovernmental Collaboration, Technical Areas, and *Vision* and *Roadmap* review and possible revision. He announced that *A Billion-Ton Feedstock Supply for a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry* study had been made available, and the Committee was given copies. Mr. Rossmeissl suggested that two-day meetings of the Committee would result in more recommendations, not just presentations and discussion.

Carolyn Fritz asked how the Committee would implement the current *Vision* and *Roadmap*, or make changes, after already spending much of its existence creating the documents. Neil Rossmeissl responded that the Committee can use both legislative mandate, and their voices as private citizens, to put out an aggressive new report with impact assessment. However, reports are not significant movers of information to the government, and the Committee needs to be talking with the government regarding policy. He suggested major improvements in the documents, and reporting on the process.

Thomas Ewing expressed an understanding of frustration caused by having limited resources with which to fulfill Committee goals. Despite his Congressional background, the Committee still has little connection to the legislature. Neil Rossmeissl responded that the Biomass R&D Act requires an annual report to Congress, for which the Committee is to provide input. He also stated that a lack of resources is a problem because the need for increased funding has not been demonstrated. Mr. Ewing and Mr. Rossmeissl then discussed how the Hydrogen Committee was able to communicate with Congress, and whether or not a similar plan would work for this Committee.

William Horan said that Neil Rossmeissl's input was appreciated. He mentioned that Secretary of Agriculture Mike Johanns is planning listening sessions around the country regarding agricultural and rural policy throughout the next two years, with a serious collective effort. This could be a good opportunity to submit a new *Vision* to the Secretary, and get the word out. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century Mr. Horan envisions agriculture as being about energy and materials. The message coming from industry is very powerful. Mr. Rossmeissl mentioned that the *Washington Post* has again quoted Cornell University professor Dr. David Pimental regarding ethanol energy balance issues. The Committee, in his view, should have some input regarding the issue. A presentation or discussion opportunity could be offered to Dr. Pimental. Michael Wang from Argonne National Laboratories has given recent presentations strongly contradicting Pimental's views. William Horan suggested a media event to make opposing information available to the public.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni said that she liked the idea of increased visibility for the Committee's positions. She also prefers the regional workshop approach to obtain feedback on the *Vision* and *Roadmap*. She would like to move forward on the *Vision*, and also see the Committee presence directed outward.

Kim Kristoff questioned what makes biomass sell, and how to get the word out to the consumer about practical, affordable biobased products, or about the Committee's position on Pimental's findings. Neil Rossmeissl responded that the Committee's current status on ethanol and bioproducts makes sense, but perhaps its approach to the public with that information is inept. He questioned the position that too much ethanol would destabilize the gasoline market, and said that a transition strategy for the Committee was in order.

The Committee broke for 15 minutes.

#### **F. FY 2005 Biomass R&D Solicitation**

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni introduced Merlin Bartz of the USDA, who began by explaining he would replace Mark Peters of the USDA as the presenter. He said that \$14 million was made available for the fiscal year (FY) 2005 joint solicitation in four technical topic areas of research. This money is made available through USDA via the Farm Bill Energy Title. The solicitation process has moved faster over time since the Committee's inception.

Merlin Bartz gave his presentation (Attachment E), titled *FY 2005 Biomass R&D Solicitation*, explaining the Joint Solicitation review process, and mentioned the 20 projects currently qualified and recommended for funding under the 2005 solicitation.

David Morris asked whether or not the public may access the proposals submitted via the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). He thought this would help the Committee monitor and evaluate biomass R&D for relevancy and cost. Neil Rossmeissl responded that once awards are made, information about the research is made public, without need for FOIA

requests. However, the independent joint solicitation reviewers can not go against Federal procurement regulations. The Committee recommends technical topics, the USDA and DOE generate requests for proposals, and thereafter the proposals are governed by proprietary procurement regulations. The public cannot view rejected proposals. DOE-awarded proposals and developed research are reported in the Office of the Biomass Program Annual Operating Plan (AOP), which is publicly-accessible. The AOP contains the scope of work, milestones, and budget. The scopes of work regarding R&D topics in the AOP are also examined publicly in Peer and Stage Gate Reviews. Merlin Bartz affirmed that proposal information is confidential until approval. The top sheet of a USDA proposal contains a description and summary, also included in the award announcement and joint solicitation matrix (provided to the Committee annually). All are public.

Carolyn Fritz said that by her calculations from information presented by Merlin Bartz, about two percent of applications for joint solicitation funding were accepted. She asked how that number compared to other programs, and thought it seemed low compared to the interest level. Merlin Bartz agreed the acceptance rate was low. He was anecdotally certain the ratio was low, and that the Small Business Innovation Research program (SBIR) funds eleven percent of applications. Ms. Fritz said the funding disparity could be pointed out in comparison with SBIR and National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding, to affect Committee recommendations in the future. Thomas Binder asked if Merlin Bartz knew how many applications were quality proposals. Carolyn Fritz asserted this would not matter in the big picture. Merlin Bartz responded that he favors pre-proposals, which indicate the number of effective full proposals coming in. Ms. Fritz asked whether the disparity in biomass R&D funding versus interest would create significant interest in Congress, and if that fact should be highlighted by the Committee. Merlin Bartz said it should, and suggested a policy recommendation by the Committee. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni advocated a one-sentence statement.

William Carlson asked whether or not funds available in other areas were taken into consideration when joint solicitation proposals are being reviewed. For example, some projects may have a better fit in a Hydrogen program solicitation. Merlin Bartz responded that the projects were reviewed in isolation from other R&D programs, and that proposals are not examined for their fit into other R&D areas. The programmatic reviewers examine historical funding and USDA overlap.

Ralph Cavalieri stated that if the Initiative granted awards in lesser amounts, it could award more of the proposals submitted. He asked how many awards went to non-government laboratories. Merlin Bartz replied that 10 of 11 selected projects were from non-government laboratories.

Thomas Ewing requested that a statement of procurement rules regarding proprietary information be given to the Committee. Neil Rossmeissl responded that grants are only given for Congressionally-directed funds in the public good. Competitive procurement is a cooperative agreement, which involves cost-sharing, and therefore limited disclosure of non-proprietary proposal information only. The accepted projects are detailed in the

AOP. The USDA is different, and the information about each project would have to come from its respective agency. The DOE can reveal AOP milestones. Mr. Ewing requested a clear statement of these rules. Merlin Bartz took it as an action item to get the rules in writing, and will work with the OGC to get the requisite information.

William Nicholson was pleased that the Committee recommendation to bring in external reviewers has evidently been heeded. Merlin Bartz responded that the DOE has improved at obtaining this balance, while the USDA needs to work on its approach. Regarding the average size of grants, Mr. Nicholson wanted the difference between large conventional lab studies, and small commercial work, to be highlighted.

Merlin Bartz said that of \$14 million in funding, about \$13 million was disbursed. The remaining \$1 million will be carried over to next year. The amount to be awarded decreased this year, as did the matching funds by awardees. Matching funds constitute about \$6.3 million, to be applied to about 30% of the funding distribution.

#### **G. Review of *Vision* goal tracking document**

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni began discussion of the *Vision for Bioenergy and Biobased Products in the United States* by directing the Committee's attention to the document *Status of Vision Goals: Biomass R&D Technical Advisory Committee* (Attachment F). Chairwoman Jaffoni then suggested the Committee appoint a subcommittee to reevaluate the *Vision* goals for biopower, biofuels, and bioproducts, as suggested by Neil Rossmeissl.

Members David Morris, Carolyn Fritz, Philip Shane, Thomas Binder, and William Nicholson stated that revision of the *Vision* document was unnecessary at this time.

William Nicholson said that some of the *Vision* goals for 2010 were well below some state mandates for those areas. He felt that leaving the *Vision* goals at around 50% of total state requirements, without a revision, would not be effective.

Kim Kristoff wanted more time spent on research and biodiesel discussion. With 20.1 million gallons of biodiesel in production, using biodiesel as a solvent product would create more value.

Delmar Raymond questioned why funding was not addressed in the *Vision*. He asked why the Nation is not further along with the goals set in the document, and suggested the chronic under funding detailed in annual reports should be emphasized. Carolyn Fritz responded that the goals set in the *Vision* document will not be met unless the Committee lays out a policy and funding strategy to meet those goals. The focus should be on how the nation can meet the goals, not on changing the goals.

Thomas Binder stated that a policy change and an economic incentive for biofuels are necessary. Regarding demand for biofuels, the current high price of oil has more effect

than research funding. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni agreed that \$60 a barrel for oil does lower the bar for alternative fuel acceptability, yet this overriding economic advantage is still not enough for refiners and blenders to process ethanol. She continued that logistics and infrastructure are lacking, and that demand has not risen on its own. Aside from the MTBE bans, which create a demand for biofuels, the rate of growth is actually lower. This environment renders the current *Vision* goals unattainable. Philip Shane responded that there is no reason for lowering the current *Vision* goals. Instead, weaknesses in current policy should be addressed. If realistic goals are not achieved, one should blame poor policy. Chairwoman Jaffoni said it had been her understanding that the Committee could not be involved in policy-making. At this time, she would like to examine that stance, and perhaps focus the Committee more on policy. Mr. Binder stated he would also like to focus on achieving the goals in the *Vision*, not changing them. He stated that oil companies refine at 100 percent capacity, which should be a goal for ethanol use. Larger-scale transportation of ethanol is possible. The petroleum industry's lock on the system includes imports of gasoline, which indicates they want to keep that market share.

Ralph Cavalieri stated it was his understanding from outside sources that there is little profit in traditional petroleum-based gasoline refining. The whole system should be considered, to assess possible profits in co-products, rather than globally-traded bulk commodities. This would raise the value of locally produced and traded products. It is his opinion that raising goals according to units of a Quadrillion Btu is not as valid as an entirely systems-based approach. William Nicholson said that a two-cent price from refinery to finished gasoline is still a net profit. Biomass is different, because the growers and refiners are a segmented market. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni added that using goals set according to petroleum-displacement theory makes them necessarily cost-focused. William Nicholson said that more detail in the *Vision* goals would help make the data relevant.

Kim Kristoff responded that the primary cost issue with ethanol use is freight. In a scenario like Brazil's, a wholesale change to the system increases access to the necessary markets. This would decrease costs. He advocates overcoming the distribution costs in this manner.

Delmar Raymond noted that with current intense production of pulp and paper in certain regions, extraction of hemicellulose from wood chips would create a large resource of pre-material that could be used for ethanol production. Integration would be a real advantage for pulp mills, and this opportunity should be pointed out in the *Vision* text.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni asked whether the Committee advocated changing the *Vision* goals at all. She suggested possible Committee inroads in reporting on current status of goals, providing narrative details, or expounding on policy relating to the *Vision* goals.

William Nicholson said that water transportation can address ethanol distribution issues the way it has for the forest industry. He would not like to lower the goals.

Delmar Raymond said it is useful to state why the goals were not achieved, including the relative percentage of funding and the overall decrease in resources for biomass R&D. He believed a new document could also be linked to the *Forest Products Roadmap*.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni stated that the *Vision* should be updated for overall goals, without worrying about specific numbers. The *Roadmap* could then include policy points made according to current funding.

The Committee broke for Lunch.

## **H. Selection and Input for a Sub-Committee to Update the *Vision***

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni asked that a subcommittee be established to debate and report to the full Committee on an update and functionalization of the *Vision* and *Roadmap* for present and new members.

Ralph Cavalieri asked what staff support would be in place for the subcommittee. Neil Rossmeissl responded that DOE would provide a budget, schedule, and statement of work for the task. The subcommittees and road shows would be tasked by the DOE.

David Morris asked what the road shows would consist of. Neil Rossmeissl answered that a review of the *Roadmap* by regional entities was in order. He said that Committee members would invite key stakeholders, develop topical questions, develop how to go forward, and possibly develop a new *Roadmap* along pathways. This would involve the subcommittee.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni offered her help, along with previous chair Thomas Ewing's.

William Carlson asked what timeframe the road show concept would adhere to. Neil Rossmeissl aimed for a year from the July 19<sup>th</sup> meeting date, published.

David Morris stated that his time on the Committee has already involved three years' development of the *Vision* and *Roadmap* in various workshops. He wondered whether the Committee could continue with the current documents. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni considered these valid statements. Perhaps the *Vision* needed updating, but not an entire revamp. Possible road shows would be for collection of public input, with the revision details to be left as the subcommittee's purview. Road shows could also convey the Committee's positions and views outward to the public.

Merlin Bartz said that Initiative-specific money from the USDA is spent on the joint solicitation. A budget item within DOE involves funding for administrative labor and project monitoring, with the USDA providing non-monetary support. Farm Bill money goes exclusively to the solicitation. Ralph Cavalieri mentioned there will be Farm Bill listening sessions held around the country, with which the *Roadmap* road shows could potentially partner.

Thomas Binder volunteered for the *Vision* and *Roadmap* subcommittee, with the observation that his Committee term will expire in November 2005. He hopes to focus on biobased policies.

Philip Shane explained that he was not convinced a subcommittee to evaluate the *Vision* or *Roadmap*, or road shows, were necessary. He thought it might be more effective to bring back the original drafting Committee for focus. Further, the incoming Committee members for 2005 might not feel acquainted with the current *Vision* and *Roadmap*, and perhaps a historical review would help with this. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni responded that a Subcommittee on the *Vision* and *Roadmap* would be first tasked with deciding which tasks were best to undertake, and whether changes to the documents were necessary. She thought update of these documents should be part of the evolution of the Committee.

William Horan mentioned that he is attending a 2525 *Vision* committee workshop for two days in March 2006, with panels of speakers on similar topics. Delmar Raymond responded that the Forest Products' Agenda 2020 program was currently redoing several roadmaps. He volunteered to function in an advisory capacity to the subcommittee proposed, to contribute the best practices of the Agenda 2020 group.

Thomas Ewing considered that his own opinion had come full circle, and that the Committee would not be able to meet with policy makers without a current revision of its core documents.

David Morris explained that in his experience of the Committee, he has seen a lack of direction, then a lack of funding available, then a decrease in funding. The Energy Bill currently in process would potentially make more funds available, and the Committee was directed to make recommendations based on R&D previously funded. Instead, Mr. Morris thought the funding was ineffectively allocated, and that some opportunities, including those for ethanol use, were lost.

William Carlson believed context exists to revisit the *Vision* and *Roadmap* documents. A lot seemed to be left out of the *Vision* narrative provided to the Committee. He would like to match outcomes to past policies, so that future R&D is clearly recommendable.

Neil Rossmeissl responded that he appreciated the five years of Committee work thus far. Should Energy Bill recommendations pass, the money involved would not be available until 2008. Instead, resources could be made available now for a quick revision of Committee documents to facilitate their use in changing policy. Mr. Rossmeissl considered now is an appropriate time, given the funding delay, to have a revised document put in place. David Morris asked for clarification of Energy Bill funds' being delayed up to 12-18 months. Neil reiterated that would be the timeframe, and Merlin Bartz agreed that DOE, with no applicable USDA funds, would wait up to that long for Energy Bill-related funding.

Thomas Ewing replied that in his experience as past chairman and advising chairman, he has seen that Congress is not aware of the Committee's activities. He would like to see policy created by an interaction with Congress.

Neil Rossmeissl reminded the Committee that they do provide regular reporting to Congress. Thomas Ewing replied that the materials provided to Congressional staffers are too much to read. Mr. Rossmeissl further said that if reporting is the only Congressional and public communication, then the Committee should consider direct contact with Congress, and facilitation of a road show.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni agreed that the Committee needed be more visible. In the current context of \$60 oil per barrel, and the Energy Bill, she thinks the *Vision* and *Roadmap* need to be current for outward Committee communication. A subcommittee would help in this aim. Merlin Bartz added that the subcommittee perspective could lead to sharing the new *Vision* and *Roadmap* with the Secretary, in this case Johanns at the USDA. He volunteered to get the current status for such submissions, and contact information. Ralph Cavalieri, William Nicholson, William Horan, and Philip Shane volunteered for the *Vision* and *Roadmap* subcommittee. William Nicholson noted his term was up for renewal in November 2004. He requested that the *Vision* be revised to address concepts of policy and technology, to be carefully integrated. William Horan noted his term ended in November 2004. He added that having two-day meetings allows Committee members to collaborate, and then take their ideas to Congress on the next day. Delmar Raymond noted that only 13 Committee members were present, and that he would like to see absentee members asked to join subcommittees. Neil Rossmeissl added that the Committee can also appoint new members to other subcommittees moving forward.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni asked for clarification of volunteering Committee members for the *Vision* and *Roadmap* Subcommittee. Thomas Binder, Ralph Cavalieri, and William Nicholson were confirmed. Del Raymond was confirmed as an advising liaison. Chairwoman Jaffoni requested that the core membership of this subcommittee work outside of the normal Committee meeting structure, inform the co-chairs about their activities, and report back to the Committee. Neil Rossmeissl recommended a weekly conference call for the subcommittee, with a one-hour time frame and a set agenda. He asked the subcommittee members to help administrative staff determine their schedule to set this up, and appoint a subcommittee chair to report out. Philip Shane asked for clarification of when a new document, or plan for one, was expected. Neil Rossmeissl expected that by the next quarterly Committee meeting, the subcommittee should have either product. He also hoped for a finished, published new document, if there was one, by March 2006.

William Horan thought it would be a good idea to roll out a new *Vision* and *Roadmap* document plan, perhaps in stage-gate form, in front of key industry figures, to help solidify government agencies' relationship with industry. He thought that the importance of biofuels and biopower should be emphasized in the *Vision*, individually and in the context of all renewables.



Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni stated that the subcommittee would decide whether the *Vision* should be changed, and report on its decision at the next Committee meeting in October, with corresponding details and recommendations. She added that a road show would contribute to a whole new set of documents by March, with all the coordination to be done by this subcommittee.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni thanked all the *Vision* and *Roadmap* subcommittee volunteers.

## **I. Review of Committee Accomplishments and Self-Evaluation**

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni directed the Committee, according to its Agenda (Addendum B), to consider its accomplishments since inception, and to conduct an evaluation of itself according to its directives. Chairwoman Jaffoni directed the Committee's attention to the evaluation form (Attachment G), and asked whether members had additional criteria.

William Nicholson suggested the topics "influence on getting R&D funds," "demonstration and commercialization," "public policy," "production and distribution," "R&D," and "facilitate rural development."

William Horan noted that after the meeting, relationships with Congressional staff and members of Congress should be evaluated.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni reminded the Committee that at its March 17, 2005 meeting, it had expressed a wish to evaluate itself, and it should now review how it would like to do this evaluation.

Ralph Cavalieri felt that the Committee was being constantly restricted by its requirements according to the Biomass R&D Act of 2000. He asked what outside goals the Committee should evaluate. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni replied that in defining the Committee's role, the evaluation would consider what fell within and outside of these requirements.

Kim Kristoff felt that if the Committee could be an arbiter of policy, then it should evaluate that role as well.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni facilitated the Committee self-evaluation with the Committee Performance Matrix (Attachment H), asking whether the Committee considered themselves effective in each area, and taking a vote for each item. The number values were recorded on the Committee Performance Matrix (Attachment H).

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni mentioned in discussion that the Interagency Biomass R&D Board and the Biomass R&D Technical Advisory Committee do meet, but that coordination between agencies besides the USDA and DOE has been lacking. This was included in the evaluation document.

## **J. Development of Committee Recommendations to Incoming Members**

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni announced that eleven new members will replace Committee members with terms ending in November 2005. She requested topics for the next quarterly Committee meeting from the members present.

Neil Rossmeissl reviewed the list of members with terms expiring, and the list of renewing and new Committee members. He explained the need for non-representative members to now undergo approval as Special Government Employees (SGEs). Mr. Rossmeissl asked that the members consider some factors, including who will replace them at term's end, and what those replacements will need to know for future Committee operations. He expressed a hope that the Committee would successfully take its advice to the external biomass community. Neil Rossmeissl requested that new members be provided government budget and procurement practices documents. Thomas Binder asked whether an explanatory packet or document was available regarding SGE approval procedures. Mr. Rossmeissl responded that there was, and that Committee members will need to undergo this approval process.

Philip Shane asked whether the appointments of Committee members were for three years, with an informal two-term limit. Neil Rossmeissl and Terri Jaffoni responded that they were. Merlin Bartz asked how many members present were in their second term. Carolyn Fritz, Philip Shane, and William Carlson responded in the positive. William Nicholson expected a large turnover of members at the next expiration in November 2005.

Chairwoman Terri Jaffoni suggested that the Committee develop and draft recommendations for new members.

Carolyn Fritz asked whether an orientation meeting could be arranged for the new Committee members [This request will be incorporated into the first Committee meeting involving new members]. Ms. Fritz suggested that Committee members receive a summary of the quarterly meeting presentations, and brief summaries of all the work that has been funded. She elaborated on a new member orientation concept, by requesting a one-day session for incoming members to receive information and ask pertinent questions ahead of a meeting.

Chairwoman Terri Jaffoni requested the Committee to direct its recommendations along the following lines:

1. What kind of background and orientation information should be given new members?
2. What administrative support and materials should be included in the new member package?
3. In what time-frame should the new members be introduced to the Committee?

William Nicholson asked that the materials be prioritized or summarized as much as possible. Neil Rossmeissl responded that it may be better to provide web links to necessary documents. Philip Shane interceded that even with the *Vision, Roadmap*, and

evaluation criteria provided online, with no free time, he did not find them helpful. William Nicholson reiterated that documents should be prioritized. Mr. Rossmeissl asked who would facilitate an orientation. He suggested that an orientation session should be facilitated by someone who could review the Committee's inception and purpose from its beginning through the present day, and that a current Committee member would best serve this function. Mr. Nicholson added that incoming members should be informed of the time requirements involved in Committee membership. William Horan said that the *Billion-Ton Feedstock Supply for a Bioenergy and Bioproducts Industry* document would be a helpful document for new Committee members to read. He also asked that they be provided background information on projects funded by the Biomass Initiative.

Thomas Ewing reminded the Committee that some previous members had accepted nominations, then not attended meetings and served as full members. He hoped the incoming members would not accept nominations unless they intended to participate. William Horan responded that an orientation session would make this clear, and allow for development of relationships and networking. This would reinforce the effectiveness of Committee membership. William Nicholson asked whether Committee members who had not participated could be removed. Neil Rossmeissl answered that, as Designated Federal Officer, that became his responsibility, and that previous DFOs had not acted to remove members. Merlin Bartz asked whether members could be removed as new members were nominated, in order to streamline the nomination process. Mr. Rossmeissl responded that this was possible, and that the DFO was liable for effectiveness of Committee functions, including the membership.

William Horan considered that travel expense vouchers for Committee members suffered an unreasonable amount of lag time in reimbursement. Thomas Ewing and William Carlson agreed. Laura Neal of BCS, Incorporated responded that an agency accounting system transfer had affected past submissions, and the process should be faster in the future. Additionally, members should inform those making travel arrangements whether they expect reimbursement in direct deposit or check form.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni requested the Committee discuss a date for their next September or October quarterly meeting. She told the Committee a late September or early October meeting date would fulfill their requirements for a quarterly meeting.

Ralph Cavalieri requested that Committee meeting dates be set a year in advance. Neil Rossmeissl responded that, should the Committee have regular Quarterly meetings, have fewer, two-day meetings, or hold additional Subcommittee meetings, more flexibility would ensue. Mr. Rossmeissl added that the Committee could consider moving meetings from Washington, DC, to other biomass-pertinent sites once a year.

Laura Neal of BCS, Incorporated submitted that the next meeting date would be affected by the new member nomination process. William Horan added that the Energy Bill could be affected by a strong Committee policy approach coming out of a meeting prior to its approval. Neil Rossmeissl, Merlin Bartz, and Phil Shane responded that the Energy Bill was currently too far along to allow for this consideration. William Nicholson said that

Committee administration should allow time for new members to arrange for their attendance. William Horan would additionally have to consider the harvest in his scheduling.

Neil Rossmeissl requested the Committee consider that the *Vision* and *Roadmap* Subcommittee would meet before October, and perhaps submit its recommendations. In addition, the Committee would need to give a list of recommendations to new members. The USDA and DOE would finalize its FY 2006 joint solicitation package prior to October, and report on budget issues in November. Mr. Rossmeissl reminded the Committee that a two-day meeting in November would also allow for recommendations from the Committee to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Energy, as required.

The Committee, in discussion, set dates for an October 3-4<sup>th</sup> New Member Orientation and Committee meeting, and a November 29<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> Committee meeting.

Thomas Binder suggested a reception to ensure the Committee interacts with the public be held the night before the October meeting. Neil Rossmeissl responded that this could be planned.

Laura Neal asked whether the Committee still expected presentations from DOE laboratories, to be given at a future meeting, a request from its March 17, 2005 meeting. Neil Rossmeissl suggested that Laboratory Relation Directors, rather than Project Investigators, give presentations. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni also advocated the Laboratory Relation Director approach. Mr. Rossmeissl gave the additional option for OBP staff to review its lab portfolio for the Committee. Delmar Raymond approved of the latter. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni added that the best time for the Committee to review the portfolio would be during the November meeting. Mr. Rossmeissl reminded the Committee that they also have to deal with 2006 lab research. Chairwoman Jaffoni suggested putting the review as an early Agenda item, to allow for the Committee's 2006 recommendations to the Secretaries of Agriculture and Energy.

Neil Rossmeissl asked whether the Committee would establish a policy subcommittee. Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni asked when the Committee would establish said subcommittee.

Merlin Bartz added that the FY 2005 and FY 2006 joint solicitation projects could be approved simultaneously, and that USDA Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment Mark Rey wants the Interagency Biomass R&D Board to meet soon, in order to approve these and aid in policy creation.

Ralph Cavalieri asked if the Joint Solicitation would be out by November. Merlin Bartz hoped that it would be out by August 2005.

Philip Shane suggested that the DOE and USDA collaborate on media releases, for more publicity. Laura Neal of BCS, Incorporated, said that could be taken as an action item. Thomas Binder responded that the National Science Foundation (NSF) and National

Academy of Science (NAS) should be recommended to publish an opinion regarding Dr. Pimental's most recent press, for publicity. Neil Rossmeissl indicated this may require funding. Carolyn Fritz suggested using leftover funds from the FY 2005 Joint Solicitation. Neil Rossmeissl said that Dr. Pimental has already refused a discussion on this matter, and Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni requested the Committee consider what action to take.

Thomas Binder moved that the Committee make a recommendation to the DOE and USDA, asking for the NAS to examine its position on ethanol and Pimental's findings. Carolyn Fritz and William Carlson seconded the motion.

Neil Rossmeissl responded to the Action by planning to formalize the request through the DOE and USDA, and to approach the NAS with inquiries about their requirements to implement the recommendation. He will report out at the next Committee meeting.

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni planned that subcommittees would be assigned new members at the next meeting, that the National Lab presentations would be postponed until the November meeting. She approved of the action item.

Neil Rossmeissl added that at the October meeting, the next few meetings' schedules would be proposed.

#### **K. Public Comment**

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni asked for any public comment. There was no public comment.

#### **L. Adjournment**

Chairwoman Terry Jaffoni thanked the Committee for being present and adjourned the meeting.

## **ADDENDUM A**

### **Biomass Research and Development Technical Advisory Committee Meeting July 19, 2005**

#### **ATTENDEES**

##### **Committee Members Present**

Wayne Barrier  
Thomas Binder  
William Carlson  
Ralph P. Cavaliere  
Carolyn Fritz  
Terry Jaffoni, Chairwoman

Kim Kristoff  
David Morris  
Delmar Raymond  
Philip Shane

##### **Interim (Non-Voting) Committee Members Present**

Thomas Ewing  
William Horan

William Nicholson

##### **Committee Members Not Present**

Roger Beachy  
Robert Boeding  
Jerrel Branson  
Robert Dorsch  
Charles Goodman  
Pat Gruber

William Guyker  
John S. Hickman  
Jack Huttner  
Gary Pearl  
Larry Walker  
John Wootten

##### **Federal Employees Present**

Merlin Bartz - USDA  
Melissa Klembara – DOE  
Roger Conway – USDA  
David Shea – USDA  
Sharon Ashurst – USDA

Marv Duncan – USDA  
Paula Geiger – USDA  
Bryce Stokes – USDA  
Parveen Setia – USDA  
Michael Pacheco - NREL

Total Public Attendees – 4

Total Attendees – 28

Designated Federal Officer – Neil Rossmeissl

## **ADDENDUM B - AGENDA**

**Public Meeting of the  
Biomass R&D Technical Advisory Committee  
July 19, 2005  
Marriott Washington  
1221 22nd St. NW, Washington, DC  
DuPont Ballroom (Rooms F, G, & H)**

### **Previous decisions or actions related to this agenda:**

At the March 17, 2005 meeting, the Committee discussed the proposed 2005 Work Plan, and prioritized meeting topics. The topics that took priority included an update on the status of the USDA Federal Procurement of Biobased Products rule and the re-evaluation of the goals established in the *Vision* document. The Committee also proposed conducting an evaluation of its accomplishments and impacts, and to use the analysis to make recommendations to incoming Committee members.

Don Richardson, with DOE, has retired since the last meeting. Neil Rossmeissl, with DOE, has taken over as Designated Federal Officer (DFO) for the Committee.

### **Prior to today's meeting, the Committee received the following documents:**

- Neil Rossmeissl's biography
- USDA/DOE MOU on Biomass to Hydrogen
- List of publications
- 2005 Work Plan
- An updated version of the *Vision* goals tracking document, with added analytical narrative
- A list of Committee accomplishments, an evaluation form, and guidelines for the Committee self-evaluation

### **Description of subjects for this meeting:**

- Update on the status/progress of the USDA Federal Procurement of Biobased Products Rule
- Introduction to Neil Rossmeissl, DFO
- Discussion on the *Vision* goals tracking document and narrative and reevaluation of *Vision* targets
- Discussion on the Committee's accomplishments, strengths and weaknesses, and development of recommendations to incoming Committee members

### **Agenda**

8:00 – 8:30	Continental Breakfast
8:30 – 8:45	Welcome and Overview of the Agenda – <i>Terry Jaffoni, Committee Chairwoman</i>

8:45 – 9:45	Update on USDA Federal Procurement of Biobased Products Rule – <i>Marv Duncan, David Shea, and Roger Conway, USDA</i>
9:45 – 10:30	Introduction, Update on Action Items from Last Meeting and Other Committee Business – <i>Neil Rossmeissl, Designated Federal Officer</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Introduction/Background and Questions</li> <li>▪ Membership Extension Issue</li> <li>▪ Permanent Sub-Committees Proposal</li> <li>▪ Status of 2004 Annual Report</li> <li>▪ Status of new member nominations/SGE rules</li> <li>▪ Status of plan for FY 2006 Joint Solicitation</li> <li>▪ USDA/DOE Hydrogen MOU</li> <li>▪ Introduction of new support staff</li> </ul>
10:30 – 10:45	Break
10:45 – 11:15	Update on the status and awardees of the FY 2005 Joint Solicitation – <i>Merlin Bartz, USDA</i>
11:15 – 11:30	Review <i>Vision</i> goal tracking document – <i>Terry Jaffoni, Chairwoman</i>
11:30 – 12:00	Discuss proposed process for updating <i>Vision</i> and <i>Roadmap</i> documents – <i>Neil Rossmeissl, DFO</i>
12:00 – 1:00	Lunch
1:00 – 2:00	Identify sub-committee for document updating. Provide input to the subcommittee – <i>Terry Jaffoni, Chairwoman</i>
2:00 – 3:00	Review Committee evaluation criteria and accomplishments and additions to list. Discussion – <i>Terry Jaffoni, Chairwoman</i>
3:00 – 3:15	Break
3:15 – 4:30	Continue to discuss evaluation criteria and accomplishments. Develop draft recommendations to incoming Committee members – <i>Terry Jaffoni, Chairwoman</i>
4:30 – 4:45	Discuss Topics for Next Meeting – <i>Terry Jaffoni, Chairwoman</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Update on OBP’s Deployment Efforts</li> <li>▪ Presentations from DOE National Laboratories</li> <li>▪ Other topics</li> </ul>
4:45 – 5:00	Public Comment



5:00

Adjourn